Vol. X, No. 47 HUMAN EVENTS November 25, 1953

THE SHAPE OF THE NEW APPEASEMENT

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

THE SOVIET NOTE of November 3, which finally banged the door, at least for the time being, on wishful dreaming about a cozy four-power conference where international tensions would abate in some miraculous way, is one of the most arrogant communications ever addressed by one great power to others. As conditions for a vague intimation of willingness to "talk" about the unification of Germany the Kremlin lays down conditions which would only seem realistic if the United States and the Western powers had been completely defeated in war.

Its demands, backed by the truculent threat that refusal to sign on the dotted line will mean "increased threat of a new world war", may be briefly summarized as follows. There must be no conferences, no joint action on the part of the United States, Great Britain and France. Red China must be promptly admitted to the United Nations and a conference on a Korean and Far Eastern settlement can only be held if all Soviet and Communist Chinese demands are satisfied in advance.

Germany is to be dealt with as if it were still the conquered, prostrate country of 1945, on the basis of that "scrap of paper", the Potsdam Agreement. American overseas air and naval bases, one of the principal deterrents to Soviet atomic and military adventures, are to be liquidated. There is to be an end of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and, of course, of any attempt to integrate Germany with Western Europe.

Such a display of arrogance is foolish and will probably be self-defeating. It should be a silencer for the fuzzy minds and faint hearts whose specialty is to plead for "one more talk with Moscow" (as if there had not been plenty of talk at Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam and the many deadlocked conferences of the postwar years) before some elementary measure of European defense like the rearming of Germany is started. The end product of conversation with the U.S.S.R. is an introduction to more conversation.

Yet, there is a disquieting element in this Soviet demand for "unconditional surrender". It would never have been put forward, in all probability, if the new masters of the Kremlin had not been encouraged by the mounting wave of appeasement on both sides of the Atlantic during the last few months. This wave reached as high as the august figure of Sir Winston Churchill and it has threatened and still threatens to erode the bases of the firmer and more courageous statements on foreign policy by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT IS THE SHAPE OF THE NEW appeasement? Its main driving forces are overseas. The 25 per cent of the vote which is regularly cast for the Communist Party in France speaks for itself. A prominent French intellectual, himself a vigorous anti-Communist with a record in the Resistance, said to me: "It will be harder to be in the resistance next time, if the Russians occupy France. For every fourth house will be an enemy house."

Apart from Communist sympathy there is a widespread neutralist, "plague on both their houses" spirit in France. This is spearheaded by the leading French newspaper *Le Monde,* which became hysterical over the execution of the Rosenbergs and which can always be depended on to shy verbal brickbats at the United States on such issues as the rearming of Germany, recognition of Red China or the holding of the line in Indo-China.

There is a similar mood in the powerful opposition British Labor Party. Like Prime Minister Nehru and other spokesmen for India our "candid friends" in the Labor ranks dispatch all their directed verbal missiles at the American target. One would have to look very hard in the fine print of the resolutions passed by Labor Party Congresses to find any intimation that the Soviet Union is at least partially responsible for the chronic state of high international tension. In England, it seems, the pro-Soviet line expresses itself in anti-Americanism.

The Soviet peace offensive which set in shortly after Stalin's death and ground to a full stop after the revolt in East Germany last June was admirably tailored to suit the psychological needs of the appeasers. Its significance was vastly overestimated. Trivial acts, which usually consisted of temporarily ceasing to do things that no civilized state would have done in the first place, such as imposing vexing and humiliating restraints on the movements of foreign diplomats or refusing to permit Russian wives to leave the country to join foreign husbands, were played up out of proportion to their real importance.

Even such an experienced statesman as Sir Winston Churchill, who struck one of the first powerful notes of alarm about the scope and threat of Soviet designs in his Fulton speech in 1946, was taken in. He furnished grist for the appeasement mill in his speech before Parliament on May 11, when he called for a top-level meeting of leading statesmen with no prior commitments or agenda (the pattern of Yalta all over again) and somewhat vaguely suggested a non-aggression pact between the West and the Soviet Union along the lines of the Locarno Treaty of 1925.

It is surprising that such a veteran negotiator as Sir Winston did not realize the great psychological disadvantage from which the side that makes the first overtures, in hot war or cold war, must suffer. It is the loser, not the winner, who traditionally throws in the sponge. The prospects for the success of an international conference at any level will be bright only if and when the Soviet leaders take the initiative in seeking such a gathering, which they show no inclination of doing at this time.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be that at some future time a non-aggression pact between the Soviet Union and the western powers, including, one might hope, a federated Europe, would be a constructive development. But to suggest such a pact now is to put the cart ahead of a horse that has not even emerged from the stable. Before a non-aggression pact could make political sense, or give any promise of being kept, Germany would have to be reunited in freedom, and with a frontier which a German government could honorably and honestly accept as final. And the Soviet grip on the satellite states would have to be relaxed. There is no indication now that either of these developments is likely to occur in the near future.

THE VOICES OF THE new appeasement in America are a motley crowd. One recognizes the old familiar fellow-travellers, now draped in the protective camouflage of anti-anti-Communism. ("We are not Communists, but. . . .") There are individuals so emotionally committed to the late war, so intent on still fighting Hitler, Mussolini and Japanese militarists that they do not seem to recognize the new team of enemies which our sweeping victory in the last war helped to make so formidable. The war in the offing is not World War II.

There are some of the oracular pundits of the last war who have not adjusted themselves to the consequences of their own and the Roosevelt Administration's sad lack of prevision as to the kind of world that was emerging from that war and the need for a swift drastic reorientation of American foreign policy. There is the unfortunately large group of Americans who repudiate sympathy with Communism and yet shrink from the logical consequences of recognizing Communism as a threat at home and abroad.

A good example of this kind of confused thinking, which bogs down in contradictions at every turn, is the letter recently issued by the General Council of the Presbyterian Church to members of 8,000 congregations throughout the country. This communication starts out by admitting the necessity of serious thought about the menace of Communism and the aim of its leaders to subvert the thought and life of the United States.

Then, and most illogically, the letter proceeds to denounce in extravagant terms what Congressional committees are doing to uncover the scope of Communist conspiracy and to make Communist subversion and infiltration more difficult in the future. "Some Congressional inquiries have revealed a distinct tendency to become inquisitions . . . which find their historic patterns in medieval Spain and in the tribunals of modern totalitarian states."

The letter contains quite unwarranted slurs on the honesty and credibility of those repentant ex-Communists who have borne witness to the conspiracy which they now abhor. And there is the stupid and thinly veiled anti-Catholicism in the following innuendo:

"Many of these witnesses have done no more, as we know, than transfer their allegiance from one authoritarian system to another."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is here an implication, both insulting and unjustified, that Communism and Catholicism may be bracketed as "authoritarian systems".

Finally, the letter offers "talk, unhurried talk . . . talk which takes place in private" as the only kind of approach which can lead to sanity and fruitful understanding. To the Poles and the other peoples behind the iron curtain, to the nationalist Chinese in exile on Formosa, that kind of "talk" could conceivably be spelled "sellout".

(Incidentally, this pronouncement of the General Council has been met with a storm of resentment within the Presbyterian Church, from both laymen and clergy.)

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY operates under the handicap of pressures which do not exist for the Kremlin. No Soviet commentator will tell Malenkov that he is too obstinate and inflexible. No professor or publicist in Moscow or Warsaw or Prague will publicly announce that war is so terrible that no concessions by the Soviet side are too great for the purpose of avoiding such a disaster. No deputy in the Congress of Soviets will urge Malenkov and Molotov to start a trip of investigation to Washington, London and Paris, to see whether there may not be some prospect of peace. The well-tamed Soviet Orthodox Church will never put out a message comparable with that of the Presbyterian Church.

In the West, on the other hand, every voice of defeatism, of naive appeasement, of confusion and inaction, is free to shout itself hoarse. This is implicit in free institutions and reasonable Americans would not have it otherwise.

But it is clear that if the new appeasement is not to do as much harm as did the wartime appeasement that reached its climax at Yalta, the men responsible for our foreign policy must often dig in firmly and brace themselves with the familiar college football slogan: *Hold That Line.* By all means let us display tact and flexibility in small things. By all means let us argue our case patiently and reasonably over and over again before the United Nations and other forums of world opinion, not overlooking American opinion.

But let us never again commit the combined crime and blunder of sacrificing faithful friends in the vain hope of placating implacable enemies. Let us never for one moment think of casting a tried and dependable friend and a potential ally of great value like Chancellor Konrad Adenauer to the wolves of French neutralists, British Bevanites and Americans who haven't outgrown the psychology of the Morgenthau-Harry Dexter White Plan for the industrial destruction of Germany. Let us think of Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee before we get involved in a flirtation with Red China. And let us never forget that a policy of appeasement, of one-sided concessions, of trading substance for shadow, is always in the red.

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED LIBRARY

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 47 Wednesday, November 25, 1953 Washington, D. C.

Hoover: In State Department circles, a boom has started in favor of Herbert Hoover, Jr., as the next Undersecretary of State. Rumors have increased recently about an imminent transfer of General Walter Bedell ("Beetle") Smith, now Undersecretary, to a bigger job in the White House. A number of names — one of them John J. McCloy, former High Commissioner to Germany — have already been popping up in print as receiving support for candidacies for this position, when vacated.

Now, talk turns to the eldest son of former President Hoover, not the least because he is now a consultant with the State Department and has just finished a trip to Iran and Britain to deal with the ticklish oil dispute between the two nations. Dispatches indicate that young Hoover has performed his diplomatic mission very well. It was Secretary Dulles who brought him into the Department and it might well be that the Secretary would like to elevate him to the post of Undersecretary.

Herbert Hoover, Jr., has followed in the footsteps of his famous father as a mining and petroleum engineer, with vast experience in and knowledge of foreign countries. He is known, like his father, for his efficiency, and administrative ability. Those who know the State Department believe that he is just the man to perform the primary mission of any Undersecretary — that is, to clean out and cut down.

Canada and Spy Probe: By telephone from our correspondent in eastern Canada, we obtain today some on-the-spot suggestions why U.S. congressional probers have had difficulties with the Canadian Government about permission to question the former Russian spy, Gouzenko.

Our correspondent makes several points. (1) The Royal Commission which brought out the big spy scandal in 1946 is not the "whited sepulchre" in Canada that it seems to be in the U.S. It is believed by some Canadians that the Commission withheld much juicy material from publication. Also, it is believed that some personalities, with powerful political connections, were shielded.

(2) "The only people fooled in Ottawa", says our correspondent, "by the Gouzenko interview with the *Chicago Tribune* correspondent in Canada are those who want to be fooled. Gouzenko did not tell the *Chicago Tribune* that he had additional information (as commonly believed). He merely indicated that he did not think all the information which he had previously given the Canadian Government had been used. There are people in Canada who get this distinction and think about it. They recall that the British Government had been informed about Fuchs, the atom spy, yet did nothing about him until too late. Perhaps — they think — Gouzenko has been similarly mishandled and some of his information completely buried."

(3) Those in the know in Ottawa are not surprised at the attitude of the Canadian External Affairs Office (Canadian State Department), for those who staff this office are persons who admired and worked with Acheson and his ilk in the U.S. for years. "They would automatically react against the Jenners and McCarthys just as their opposite numbers under Acheson did."

Not Merely Gossip: Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson has publicly deplored the fact that we gave away to Russia, after World War II, part of Germany's submarine fleet. There is a story behind this which explains why Wilson was provoked to such angry comment. The National Security Council, the

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

top strategy board of the Executive, sent a memorandum to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, giving a dim view of the European Army's future, because — it was asserted — any such army could not be supplied through European ports. Why? Because the Russian submarine fleet, equipped with atomic weapons could devastate these ports from a safe distance out at sea. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, however, declined to comment on the strategic implications save to remark that "any change in our strategy would not be politically feasible".

● Senator Jenner, they say, gets disturbed whenever certain persons praise his investigation. Mrs. Agnes Meyer, wife of Eugene Meyer, publisher of the *Washington Post* (dubbed the "Washington Daily Worker" by Senator McCarthy), praised the Jenner Committee. When Jenner, visiting his state of Indiana, heard about this unusual compliment, he phoned his committee office in Washington and asked, "what's the matter?"

● It has not been generally reported but GOP circles know that on November 18, their widely popular National Chairman, Mr. Leonard Hall, talked privately of resigning his post. Reason: Ike's statement expressing hope that Communists-in-Government will not be an issue in the 1954 elections. In view of Hall's previous statement — that Communism would be an issue of 1954 — the Chairman could quite logically conclude that the President had repudiated him. However, cooler considerations prevailed and Hall made a statement praising the GOP handling of the White case. GOP circles believe that it would be a disaster if Chairman Hall resigned or was forced out.

● Behind the current revelations of McCarthy on the Ft. Monmouth affair, there lies a tale. The victory for truth in the Harry D. White case is no indication that the powerful forces in the country which have sought to stifle such subversive investigations have finally given up. For, there has been an attempt in the last ten days to whitewash the McCarthy investigations of the Signal Corps radar establishment at Ft. Monmouth, N.J. McCarthy was able to probe with freedom and Army Secretary Stevens showed every sign of collaborating. However, Stevens suddenly and unexpectedly gave an interview in which he suggested that the probe had turned up no evidence of espionage at Ft. Monmouth in recent years. At about this time, it was privately rumored that the Army had come under heavy pressure to stifle the inquiry. McCarthy acted swiftly, ordering open hearings. And Stevens came out with a statement saying the press had misquoted him when it reported him saying that there had been no espionage at Ft. Monmouth.

One World Waste: "As an American taxpayer", writes E. M. Queeny in the *Monsanto Magazine* (St. Louis, Missouri), issue of October-November, "I am happy to bear my full share of the cost of whatever can be done efficiently, but I should like to see the end of the UN farce in Korea. Great Britain has contributed but 0.8 per cent of the cost of Korea's relief to date but seems to have as great a voice as the United States in the expenditure of appropriations. Great Britain never had more than four batallions on the front line, but exercised an influence on military policy in inverse ratio to its participation." Queeny (Chairman of the Board of the Monsanto Chemical Company) recently returned from a trip to Korea (and around the world) with a group of American business and professional leaders.

He describes UNKRA (United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency): "Although as of June 20, 1953, France had made no monetary contribution whatsoever, UNKRA's Korean Mission is headed by a French General with an American assistant. All planning is in charge of a British subject, a former YMCA administrator. His assistant is another British subject whose only experience has been in the U.N. . . . Its (UNKRA's) budget for the current fiscal year is $117,000,000 of which nations other than the United States are down for $40,000,000, payable in cash, services or in kind, if they ante up. . . . As of June 30, 1953, Great Britain contributed but $4,540,000 to UNKRA; Canada, $6,900,000; all other nations, $4,400,000 in cash or kind. United States contributed $50,750,000, in cash."

Queeny offers a solution: "If we could unshackle ourselves from United Nations in this area, all official Korean rehabilitation agencies could be consolidated into one and could be administered more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

efficiently and economically by Americans. Are not American taxpayers entitled to the principle of 'no taxation, no representation'?"

Now-We've-Heard-Everything Dept.: From the Annual Report, for 1952, just issued by the Rockefeller Foundation: "Professor Muzafer Sherif of the University of Oklahoma conducted an unusual experiment a few years ago on the development of hostility and conflict between social groups. Working with boys in a summer camp, he divided *initially friendly* boys into rival groups." (Emphasis ours.)

Then, it appears, Professor Sherif deliberately, surreptitiously and secretly planted ideas in the heads of the boys and played upon their emotions in such a way that the friendly rivalry between the groups was converted into a hostile one. He also worked upon individuals in each group, causing each to brood over notions that had never occurred to him before — about his racial, religious, social and economic background — thus developing grudges and resentments.

Thereby he "stimulated and intensified these (hostile) attitudes" and wrote a paper for his associates and classes in the "social sciences" showing how to do it.

"Professor Sherif", the Report continues, "is now preparing a similar experiment in which he will repeat the procedures of the first experiment and *then attempt* to develop harmony and cooperation between the hostile groups. The Rockefeller Foundation has made a grant of $38,000 for this two-year study." (Emphasis ours.)

White Case: An official who was inside the Truman regime when Harry D. White's name was bandied back and forth between FBI, White House and Treasury has made some important statements which have not received sufficient notice. The man is J. Anthony Panuch, at one time Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Administration in 1945-46. Panuch on the program "Hardy Burt Comments", Mutual Broadcasting System, November 15, stressed the political motivation behind Truman's hushing up of the White Case. The former State Department official (now in private law practice) sketched the "fight within the Administration between its pro-American and pro-Soviet elements for control of our foreign policy" and mentioned, as one example, the struggle over the Morgenthau plan.

"Then followed", said Panuch, "the showdown over our pro-Soviet appeasement policy in the same year in the State Department between Assistant Secretary of State Berle and the pro-Soviet group led by Dean Acheson and Alger Hiss. This behind-the-scenes struggle received no publicity until 1945 when it came to the surface in a big way in the *Amerasia* scandal, which involved the misappropriation of some 1700 classified documents by pro-Soviet State and Navy Department personnel. On top of this came the resignation of General Patrick Hurley from his post as Ambassador to Nationalist China because American interests were being sabotaged by pro-Communist personnel on his staff.

Burt: And the publicity involved in these cases was damaging to the Administration?

Panuch: Very much so. Despite the fact that the *Amerasia* case was hushed up and General Marshall was sent to China to replace Ambassador Hurley, there was a tremendous demand by the public and the Congress to clean out all Communists, fellow-travellers, Soviet sympathizers and other subversives from the government. Subversives and spies in the goverment were a hot political issue in 1945 and six.

Burt: What bearing did this political situation have on the nomination of Harry Dexter White?

Panuch: Just this. White was a very hot potato. The Administration was in a dilemma. White was the architect of the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference which set up the International Fund. The pro-Soviet clique in the government had built him up as Executive Director of the Fund. If he were *not* nominated for the post, or if he were nominated and *not* confirmed by the Senate as a result of the FBI report on him, it would have been a crushing defeat for the pro-Soviet clique in the government. They had to get him nominated and confirmed at all costs. That may explain why the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency did not receive a copy of the FBI reports on White.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Burt: So for President Truman to have withdrawn White's nomination after he was confirmed, or to refuse to issue his commission, would have been politically impracticable?

Panuch: Exactly. It would have been an admission — on the eve of the 1946 congressional campaign — that the architect of the Morgenthau Plan and of the Bretton Woods Conference was unfit to be the Executive Director of the Fund. It would have cracked the issue of subversive infiltration of the government wide open not only in 1946 — but in the national election of 1948.

'Twaren't So Bad: "Do you want to go back to 1929?" was the scathing retort of Truman when his profligacy with the taxpayers' money was brought up. It is still the stock answer of "progressives" to those who point with alarm to the consequences of interventionism, controls, etc.

Now President Eisenhower is going his predecessor one better. Do you want to go back to 1892?, he says, and the newspaper pundits who have relagated everything before Roosevelt to the Dark Ages, applaud. But, just as some recent studies of the Dark Ages indicated that they weren't so dark after all, so a little research will show that the period of "1892" had some advantages over the present.

For instance, we remember our mother talking of "the good old days" when milk — hold your seats — sold for 4 cents a quart. For seventy-five cents our father shod us, and for three dollars he got us a Sunday suit. In those days nobody worried about income taxes — there weren't any.

But, it was not so much in the field of economics that "1892" had some advantages over the present, though it can be proven that wages, *as a proportion of production*, were higher than they are now. The real advantage of "1892" over the present was in the area of human freedom. Remember, there was no conscription. In those days the boy who went into the army was a ne'er-do-well, a fellow who could not make good. And no mother prayed secretly that her boy might develop some physical deficiency that would keep him out of the draft.

In "1892" there was no "foreign problem" to worry about, and the "minority problems" of the day were something only professors worried about; the gates of America were open to all who would come here and act decently. Remember, this was the "land of the free and the home of the brave". Nobody in those days had to carry a wallet full of tickets to justify his existence; everybody was considered a person, not a "social security" number.

Washington was a place where some smart alecks debated, and the rest of the country tolerated it as they would any other freak of nature. There was no bureaucracy to support. The newspaper ran Washington news on an inside page — think of that! — while the headlines were given over to juicy scandals, raging fires, real life whodunits. The really important matters were those related to your neighbors and your local affairs. The "special feature" section of your Sunday paper usually included the words and music of the latest hits.

Women did not vote, but they were respected; every boy was expected to, and did, tip his hat, even to his own mother. No male would sit down in a public conveyance if a lady — even if she wore pigtails — could not find a seat. You see, "progressive" education had not come in. For that reason, too, our magazines gave you articles written by authors who at least knew the English language.

We could go on indefinitely with the glories of "1892". It is a mistake to think that life began in America with the present. If "1892" was so bad, why did we select as our president a man who was bred in that era?

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED